Mr. HUSSEIN ALI BEIG.—What is the salary of the Minister for Law?

Mr. PRESIDENT.—I think that is not a relevant question.

Mr. V. VENKATASWAMY CHETTY.—As Electrical Adviser to Government, can Mr. Forbes take up any other work under other Governments or Companies also?

Mr. M. G. MEHKRI.—I have already stated that he is a full-time servant of this Government.

Mr. V. VENKATASWAMY CHETTY.—Am I then to take it that he cannot take up any other work?

Mr. M. G. MEHKRI.—Not without the previous permission of the Government.

Mr. Bhupalam R. CHANDRASEKHA RAYYA.—Have the Government come to know that people of the State are not in favour of the service of Mr. Forbes being extended?

Mr. M. G. MEHKRI.—No.

Mr. C. RAMASWAMY CHETTY.—Before taking up appointment as Chief Electrical Engineer in Mysore, was Mr. Forbes working in the General Electric Company of America?

Mr. M. G. MEHKRI.—Notice.

Mr. C. RAMASWAMY CHETTY.—Is it a fact that all materials are being got from that Company?

Mr. M. G. MEHKRI.—That question has been already put and answered.

Mr. MANJAPPA GOWDA.—What is the age of superannuation in the case of officers of technical departments?

Mr. M. G. MEHKRI.—If they are strong enough, they may be retained even up to sixty or seventy years of age.

Mr. MANJAPPA GOWDA.—Is it the opinion of Government that the efficiency and intelligence of Mr. Forbes are increasing with age?

Mr. M. G. MEHKRI.—I am not here to express any opinions.

Mr. MANJAPPA GOWDA.—What is the age of Mr. Forbes now?

Mr. M. G. MEHKRI.—He may be about seventy.

Mr. MANJAPPA GOWDA.—What was the pay of Mr. Forbes in 1913?

Mr. M. G. MEHKRI.—I think he rose from Rs. 750 upward.

Mr. MANJAPPA GOWDA.—When is the period of the present extension of Mr. Forbes to close?

Mr. M. G. MEHKRI.—The extension, I think, is for one year.

Mr. MANJAPPA GOWDA.—Is there any agreement by virtue of which he gets the extension?

Mr. M. G. MEHKRI.—I think it is all regulated by the original agreement.

Mr. MANJAPPA GOWDA.—Does Mr. Forbes bear any relationship to Sir Charles Todhunter?

Mr. PRESIDENT.—I am afraid the member has got it all wrong.

ADJOURNMENT MOTION.

Recent Appointment of Mr. Forbes as Electrical Adviser to Government.

Mr. K. CHENGALARAYA REDDY stated that he and other members of his party had given notice of an adjournment motion that the business of the House be suspended to discuss a question of urgent public interest, namely, the recent appointment of Mr. Forbes as Electrical Adviser to Government and asked for leave of the House to move the same. He said that this was a definite matter of public importance and that therefore the requirements of the rules concerning the adjournment motions had been fully satisfied in this case . . .

The PRESIDENT observed that the member need not make any speech in asking for leave of the House to move the adjournment motion.

Mr. K. CHENGALARAYA REDDY replied that he wanted to make out a case for the motion, so that the President might consider it and then decide whether the adjournment motion should be allowed or not.

The PRESIDENT stated that the merits of the case need not be gone into at that stage.

Mr. CHENGALARAYA REDDY replied that he did not propose to discuss the merits. He merely wanted to show that it was a question of urgent public interest and one of recent origin.

The PRESIDENT again told the member that no such speech could be made at that stage.

Mr. CHENGALARAYA REDDY maintained that a speech such as he was making was warranted by conventions in other Houses of Legislature. He assured the President that he was not going to speak on the merits of the motion.

The question now for consideration was whether the adjournment motion should be admitted or not, whether the subject-matter of the motion was of recent occurrence and whether it was also urgent and finally whether the question raised was a definite matter or not. It would facilitate a proper ruling, if the member seeking to move the adjournment motion made out that all those conditions were fully satisfied.

The PRESIDENT observed that he was not sure that it was usual or necessary to say all those things in moving for the leave of the House.

Mr. CHENGALARAYA REDDY admitted that the President had the authority to disallow the motion. As a matter of fact, as Dewan, he could have turned it down even at an earlier stage.

The PRESIDENT stated that he was presiding over the House only as President and not as Dewan.

Mr. CHENGALARAYA REDDY stated that there was nothing to prevent his exercising powers even as Dewan.

The PRESIDENT replied that he did not propose to do so.

Mr. CHENGALARAYA REDDY observed that there was, however, nothing to prevent him from doing so.

Mr. Bhupatam R. CHANDRASEKHARAYYA suggested that the President may be pleased to allow discussion as to whether the adjournment motion was in order or not and then give a ruling.

The PRESIDENT drew the attention of the member to rule 21 of the Rules and Standing Orders of the Assembly and added that under that Standing Order the member could merely ask for leave to move the adjournment motion. He did not feel that there was any necessity for an elaborate speech.

Mr. CHENGALARAYA REDDY stated that to admit the adjournment motion or not was entirely within the discretion of the President. But, in asking for leave to make the motion, it was the duty of the member to assign sufficient reasons therefor. That alone would give him an opportunity to make out a case for the adjournment motion being permitted to be moved.

The PRESIDENT was not sure that a discussion was indicated at that stage and, without prejudice to any future ruling which he might give, he asked the member not to expatiate upon that part of his case.

Mr. CHENGALARAYA REDDY said that he was not going to discuss the merits nor refer to any points which might be referred to later in case the adjournment motion was going to be taken up.

The PRESIDENT was not sure that the member could avoid reference even to such points.

Mr. CHENGALARAYA REDDY assured the President that he was going to avoid it.

The PRESIDENT then permitted the member to proceed on that understanding.

Mr. CHENGALARAYA REDDY then referred to the requirements of Standing Order 15 and tried to show that the subject-matter of the adjournment motion was one of recent occurrence. He said that members were expected to give fifty days notice of ordinary questions, representations and resolutions. The appointment of Electrical Adviser to Government had not been created by the time questions, etc., could be sent up by members. It was announced subsequent to the last date for sending up subjects. Therefore the appointment must be regarded as an incident of recent occurrence. Secondly, the creation of a new post and the appointment of a particular individual to it was certainly a definite matter. As regards the urgency of the matter, if the members did not discuss the question on that occasion and told the Government what they felt about it, they would be forgoing the opportunity of doing so for a long period of eight months to follow. Meanwhile, most of the period allowed to the officer in question would have lapsed. In these

ways, all the characteristics of an adjournment motion were fulfilled in the present case.

Mr. Bhupalam R. CHANDRASEKHARAYYA invited attention to the fact that another adjournment motion on the same subject had been given notice of by himself and 113 other members and requested that that adjournment motion also might be taken up for consideration along with the one in question.

The PRESIDENT then made a statement to the following effect:—

The adjournment motion given notice of by Mr. Chengalaraya Reddy and other members of his party was that the business of the House be adjourned to discuss a definite urgent matter of public importance, to wit, the recent creation of a new post of Electrical Adviser to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja and the appointment of Mr. S. G. Forbes to that post. Mr. Bhupalam R. Chandrasekharayya and several other members have also given notice of a similar adjournment motion. When so many members belonging to more than one party had sent up such a motion, the President was very reluctant to rule that the adjournment motion was not in order. He very much liked to admit it if only there was some way open to him to do so. Nevertheless, he, like the members, was bound by the rules which required, among other things, that the subject-matter of the adjournment motion should be a matter of urgent public importance. The appointment referred to in the motion had been made some time before, and if that appointment had been such as to affect adversely the best interests of the State as a whole, these adjournment motions might well have been moved much earlier. That had not been done. Following the spirit of some previous rulings, it was clear, said the President, that the present adjournment motions were not such as could be admitted. He did not believe that the question was so urgent as to warrant the adjournment of the business of the House At the same time, it was his desire to allow the fullest possible scope for members to discuss this matter otherwise than in the shape of an adjournment motion. That was the reason why even in the course of supplementary questions and answers, he had referred to his proposed ruling, though somewhat prematurely. And this was also the reason why he had allotted some fifteen minutes more for supplementary questions and answers, so that the question might be gone into in all its aspects by the members.

Messrs. K. CHENGALARAYA REDDY and **K. HANUMANTHIAH** said that even though some extra time was given for questions and answers, no discussion on the subject in question could be carried on.

The PRESIDENT observed that it all depended on the way in which members managed to put questions. That question apart, it was his desire that the fullest scope for discussion should be allowed because an unusually large number of members seemed interested in it. But at the same time it would be well if members of the House moved for an adjournment of the business of the House only in very special circumstances. Otherwise, it might amount to abuse of the powers and privileges of the House. It was in this view that he felt reluctantly compelled to disallow both the adjournment motions.

Mr. CHENGALARAYA REDDY said that the disallowance of the adjournment motion by the President . . .

The PRESIDENT told the member that he could not discuss the ruling given by the Chair.

Mr. CHENGALARAYA REDDY said the ruling had caused great disappointment to the members and that such disappointment and dissatisfaction were growing of late.

The PRESIDENT requested the member not to make any speech or offer criticism, but to resume his seat.

Mr. CHENGALARAYA REDDY stated that to demonstrate their dissatisfaction with the ruling, members of his party were walking out of the Assembly. He requested the President not to misunderstand their action.

The PRESIDENT observed that if Mr. Chengalaraya Reddy and the members of his party were walking out

for the reason stated, they were adopting a very improper procedure.

Mr. K. C. SUBBANNA asked whether it was open to members of the Assembly to challenge rulings from the Chair.

Mr. K. CHENGALARAYA REDDY replied that they were not challenging the ruling. But they were merely showing their displeasure at a particular ruling.

The members of the Congress party then staged a walk out.

Rao Bahadur N. S. NANJUNDIAH submitted that he and some of his friends were also walking out of the House for ten minutes to show their dissatisfaction with the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. N. S. Nanjundiah, Mr. Bhupalam R. Chandrasekharayya and three or four other members also walked out.

REPRESENTATIONS.

No. 1.—Representation of Muslims in the Gazetted ranks of the Engineering Department.

Mr. T. M. KHAN (Tumkur *cum* Kunigal, Mahomedan—Rural).

Mr. T. M. KHAN prayed that, as the representation of the Muslim community in the Gazetted ranks of the Engineering Department was very meagre, the Government be pleased to appoint Muslim Engineering graduates as probationers to start with.

Mr. SYED MOHIYUDDIN SAHEB supported the representation. He stated that in order to take their Engineering Degree the Muslim youths must have put in several years and incurred a lot of expenditure and it would be a poor consolation to them to be started on small salaries of Rs. 50. Besides, it would take a long number of years for them to reach higher posts. He therefore requested that some special preference be shown to Muslim graduates by giving them Gazetted appointments in the Engineering Department.

Mr. S. N. M. RAZVI stated that the encouragement given to Muslim Engineering graduates in Madras was much more substantial than in Mysore. The graduates were first appointed as probationers and after one or two years service, they were appointed as regular Engineers. He requested that similar preference be shown to Muslim graduates in Mysore.

Mr. SYED ABDUL RAHIMAN endorsed the opinion of the previous speaker.

The SECRETARY to GOVERNMENT, PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT (Mr. M. G. Mehkri) replied that Muslim graudates who passed the B.E. and also completed their practical training were being appointed as Sub-overseers on Rs. 50. In a very short time, as vacancies in the Overseer's grade occurred, they were getting promotions in the grade of Rs. 80 rising to Rs. 125. This concession was available not merely to Muslims in particular, but to as many non-Brahmin graduates as possible. It was difficult, for Government to agree that such a special treatment should be confined to Muslim graduates only.

Mr. T. M. KHAN stated that he never intended that the special preference should be confined to Muslim graduates only. His request was that Muslim graduates as well as other non-Brahmin graduates might be taken as probationers in the Gazetted ranks.

Mr. M. G. MEHKRI replied that as far as possible, Government were giving special encouragement to them in all departments of Government.

No. 2.—Exempting the raiyats in villages from *night kaval* duty.

Mr. S. VENKATASAMI GOWDA (Malur—Rural).

Mr. S. VENKATASAMI GOWDA represented that the raiyats in villages toiled hard from 5 o'clock in the morning to 9 o'clock in the night, attending to their agricultural operations. It did not seem proper to entrust them with *night kaval* duty after the day's hard work. Neither could they discharge their duties satisfactorily. It was a sad commentary, on the system that, of the raiyats who paid land assessment, only those in villages were required to attend to *night kaval* duty while those in the taluk headquarters